

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 27, 2006. Claims 1 to 16 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 6, 8, 10 and 16 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication that Claim 16 is allowable. In this regard, Claim 16 has been amended in a manner not believed to affect its allowability. Accordingly, Claim 16 is believed to remain in condition for allowance.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the indication that Claims 1 to 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the § 112 rejection.

In the meantime, the title was again objected to as allegedly being non-descriptive. While Applicant believes the previously amended title was descriptive of the claimed invention, a new title has nonetheless been provided for. Withdrawal of the objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Office Action alleges that the phrase “transmitting a device ID” has insufficient antecedent basis. In this regard, without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Claims 1, 6, 8 and 10 have been amended so as to clarify which device ID is being transmitted. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 113178v1